

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

CHARLES L. BOBO,

Plaintiff,

v.

TULARE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY,

Defendant.

Case No. C13-2202-RAJ

**REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION**

The Court has reviewed Charles Bobo's pro se complaint and application to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), Dkt. 1, and recommends **DENYING** the IFP application and **DISMISSING** the complaint with prejudice for the reasons below.

(1) Mr. Bobo filed a complaint against the Tulare County District Attorney and Kings County Dependency Unit regarding the dependency of his daughter and the support he was ordered to pay. Dkt. 1. Mr. Bobo has filed similar complaints in *Bobo v. Tulare County District Attorney*, C12-1805-RSL; *Bobo v. Tulare County*, C13-1449-RSM; *Bobo v. Tulare County*, C11-1557-JCC; and *Bobo v. Tulare County*, C13-753-RSM. Given this pattern, the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez ordered that in deciding whether to grant Mr. Bobo IFP status, the Court must determine whether good cause exists to permit the action to go forward, and that "Mr. Bobo cannot file the same claims against the same defendant if those claims were dismissed with

1 prejudice.” *See Bobo v. County of Fresno Dependency Court*, C13-1044-RSM, at Dkt. 7.

2 (2) The present complaint is essentially the same complaint Mr. Bobo filed in C13-  
3 753-RSM and C12-1805-RSL both of which were dismissed with prejudice. Accordingly, the  
4 Court recommends **DENYING** Mr. Bobo’s IFP application and **DISMISSING** the present  
5 complaint with prejudice.

6 Mr. Bobo is advised that this Report and Recommendation is not an appealable order.  
7 Thus he should not file a notice of appeal seeking review in Court of Appeals for the Ninth  
8 Circuit until District Judge Richard A. Jones enters a judgment in this case. Mr. Bobo is also  
9 advised he may file objections to this Recommendation for Judge Jones’s review. Objections are  
10 limited to five pages. If Mr. Bobo wishes to file objections, he must file them no later than  
11 **December 31, 2013**. The Clerk should note the matter for **January 3, 2014**, as ready for the  
12 District Judge’s consideration. The failure to timely object may affect the right to appeal.

13 DATED this 17<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2013.

14  
15 

16 BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA  
17 United States Magistrate Judge  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23